

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ANALYTICAL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, §
§
Plaintiff, §
§
v. §
§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-cv-00445-JRG-RSP
AMERICAN DAIRY QUEEN (Lead Case)
CORPORATION, §
§
Defendant. §

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Starbucks Corporation’s Motion to Compel Discovery Responses. **Dkt. No. 93.** Starbucks moves to compel adequate responses to two Starbucks RFAs and two interrogatories. *Id.* at 1. The Court heard argument on this Motion on February 24, 2025.¹ The Motion is **DENIED** as to the RFA responses and **GRANTED**, to the extend provided below, as to the interrogatories.²

It is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff Analytical Technologies, LLC (“AT”) supplement its response to Starbucks Interrogatory No. 1 to provide information about AT’s initial capitalization, and its monthly bank statements. Additionally, AT is **ORDERED** to provide to Starbucks its Operating Agreement, referenced in response to Interrogatory No. 1.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that AT supplement its response to Interrogatory No. 2.

It is **FINALLY ORDERED** that any deposition of Starbucks’s counsel in this matter is **STAYED** pending disposition of Starbucks’s Motion for Protective Order.

¹ The Court also heard argument about Starbucks’s Motion for Protective Order Quashing Plaintiff’s Deposition Notice of Starbucks’s Lead Counsel Rachael Lamkin. **Dkt. No. 96.** The Court **CONTINUED** the resolution of the Motion pending Plaintiff’s opposition brief.

² Plaintiff also seeks attorneys’ fees under Rule 37(a)(5)(A). Dkt. No. 93 at 7. The Court does not find that fees are appropriate here.

SIGNED this 25th day of February, 2025.



ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE